

Mr. Speaker, we can do better. I call on the Republicans to abandon the cynical strategy put forth by their leaders and think for themselves.

CONFIDENTIAL MESSAGING MEMO—FLOOR DEBATE ON IRAQ AND THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

This week, the House of Representatives will engage in a debate about the war in Iraq, the Global War on Terror and our efforts to strengthen our national security in a post-9/11 world.

The past week has brought news of several important, positive developments in Iraq and the Global War on Terror:

U.S. military forces eliminated the terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, al-Qaeda's top commander in Iraq and a cold-blooded killer.

The Iraqi government named new interior, defense and security ministers as part of the new government's continued progress.

Just this morning, President George W. Bush traveled to Baghdad to meet the newly appointed Prime Minister of Iraq, Nouri al-Maliki and to discuss our growing partnership with the new democratic ally.

Clearly, these positive developments are the result of steadfast support of both our military and diplomatic efforts in Iraq and across the globe. We should not refrain from touting such progress.

During this debate, our Republican Conference should be focused on delivering these key points:

THE IMPORTANCE OF OUR ACTIONS

It is imperative during this debate that we re-examine the conditions that required the United States to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq in the aftermath of the attacks of September 11, 2001.

The attacks we witnessed that day serve as a reminder of the dangers we face as a nation in a post-9/11 world. We can no longer expect oceans between us and our enemies to keep us safe. The plotting and planning taking place in terror camps protected by rogue regimes could no longer go unchecked or unchallenged. In a post-9/11 world, we could no longer allow despots and dictators like the Taliban and Saddam Hussein to ignore international sanctions and resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council.

So, during this debate we must make clear to the American people that the United States had to take action in the best interests of the security of our nation and the world community. As Republicans who supported military action against Saddam Hussein and terrorists around the globe, the United States had to show our resolve as the world's premier defender of freedom and liberty before such ideals were preyed upon, rather than after standing witness to their demise at the hands of our enemies.

As President John F. Kennedy once stated so eloquently:

"The cost of freedom is always high, but Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender, or submission."

A PORTRAIT OF CONTRASTS

This debate in the House of Representatives gives our Republican Conference the opportunity to present the American people our case for strong national security policies whose purpose is to protect the nation against another attack on our own soil.

Similarly, we must conduct this debate as a portrait of contrasts between Republicans and Democrats with regard to one of the most important political issues of our era. Articulating and advocating our core principles will allow the American public to witness Members of Congress debate a fundamental question facing America's leaders:

In a post-9/11 world, do we confront dangerous regimes and the threat of terrorism

with strength and resolve, or do we instead abandon our efforts against these threats in the hopes that they will just fade away on their own?

Republicans believe victory in Iraq will be an important blow to terrorism and the threat it poses around the world. Democrats, on the other hand, are prone to waver endlessly about the use of force to protect American ideals. Capitol Hill Democrats' only specific policy proposals are to concede defeat on the battlefield and instead, merely manage the threat of terrorism and the danger it poses.

These are troubling policies to embrace in a post-9/11 world. During this debate, we need to clarify just how wrong the Democrats' weak approach is and just how dangerous their implementation would be to both the short-term and long-term national security interests of the United States.

RESOLVE WILL TRIUMPH OVER RETREAT

As a result of our efforts during this debate, Americans will recognize that on the issue of national security, they have a clear choice between a Republican Party aware of the stakes and dedicated to victory, versus a Democrat Party without a coherent national security policy that sheepishly dismisses the challenges America faces in a post-9/11 world.

Let there be no doubt that America and its allies in the war in Iraq and the Global War on Terrorism face difficult challenges. The American people are understandably concerned about our mission in a post-Saddam Iraq. There have been many tough days since Iraq's liberation and transition to a sovereign democracy.

Democrats are all too eager to seize upon the challenges we face as their rationale or motivation for retreat. As Republicans, we understand the diplomatic and national security hazards of such a move.

We must echo the American public's understanding of just how great the stakes are in Iraq and our long-term efforts to win the War on Terrorism.

Building democracies in a part of the world that has known nothing but tyranny and despotism is a difficult task. But achieving victory there and gaining democratic allies in the region will be the best gift of security we can give to future generations of Americans.

IRAQ DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, we do have an important debate coming before this House tomorrow discussing what we are doing to defend America through what the President calls the war on terror; what I refer to as the war against Islamic extremists.

I had a colleague earlier refer to the big lie. Well, there is a big lie propagated by the left in this country that we have no enemies abroad; and beyond that, we should not fight those enemies where they are.

We are making progress in this war against Islamic extremists. Make no mistake about it, this is a generational fight. While my grandparents fought the Nazis and my parents fought the Communists, very harsh ideologies that sought to destroy our way of life, that sought to destroy who we are as Americans, we too have a generational

fight in this war against Islamic extremists.

And I will say in the last week we have seen some very positive prospects coming from Iraq. There are those who want to deny that we are making progress, and they have every right and ability to do that because we have freedom of speech here in the United States because of our constitutional freedoms. We are trying to bring that same level of freedom to those that are living in repressive regimes, which those repressive regimes are the ones that are propagating terror against us in the United States. So if we spread peace and freedom and democracy around the world, we will have fewer enemies that seek to destroy us and to kill Americans.

Now, in the last week we saw the destruction of Zarqawi, a militant extremist in Iraq, a terrorist mastermind, who was seeking to destroy our troops, to hurt our men and women in Iraq and to destroy the progress they are making for themselves in Iraq. But we did root him out. That was a wonderful, positive step. We should be proud of that action.

Beyond that, we saw progress with the government of Iraq taking shape and form with the security ministers being put into place and the final government being put into place. We are making progress there in Iraq and we should be proud of that.

Beyond that, there are extremists in Israel. There are extremists in Afghanistan and throughout the Middle East and some in this country that seek to destroy us. This is the reality of the day. Some would say we should deal with them with a legal strategy. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say that is really removed from the realities of the war that we are fighting.

Our enemy hates our values. Our enemy hates our freedoms. Our enemy hates our capitalism that we embrace in this country. So we must fight them wherever they are and by any means possible.

But the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, don't want to fight this war. They know it is hard. They know it is difficult. But I would say to the left in this country, Mr. Speaker, that if we do not fight them, the values which they cherish, the freedom of speech and the freedom of dissent which we have in this country, the right to vote, the actual equality that we strive for in this country, although imperfect, the equality that we strive for, whether it be females having a place in society which we embrace here in this country, those extremists would not want that to happen. They want burqas worn by women. They don't want their participation. They don't want them to own property or have freedom of speech, wholly removed from what is our reality here in this country, although imperfect. But we strive for those values, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, our enemy will fight us in any way possible. We must have a

debate on this House floor on what means we are going to use, what direction we should take in this war on terror. This is a generational fight, and we as Americans must step up to the challenge and embrace the fight or they will destroy us.

IRAQ AND H. RES. 861

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning the President of the United States said this about Iraq: "My message to the enemy is don't count on us leaving before we succeed. Don't bet on American politics forcing my hand because it's not going to happen."

Except, Mr. Speaker, it is completely unclear what constitutes success under these circumstances. Saying we will stand down when they stand up, well, that is just a talking point that gives the American people no clear guide as to when they can expect this war to end.

By leaving this question vague, by defining success entirely on his own secret terms, the President is allowing himself an open-ended commitment and a blank check in Iraq. As for his hand being forced by American politics, what the President calls American politics is actually a majority of Americans, American citizens outraged at the loss of life, the hundreds of billions spent, and the global credibility we have squandered.

Our people see 2,499, as of yesterday, U.S. troops killed; more than 18,000 U.S. soldiers gravely wounded, and thousands of others mentally and physically traumatized from their experience in the war. They see us losing the equivalent of one battalion every month in Iraq.

And they want answers.

All these sacrifices, and for what? None of it is making Americans or Iraqis safer. In fact, the presence of nearly 150,000 American troops in Iraq has become a rallying point for anti-American extremists in the Arab world.

This war becomes a bigger catastrophe with every passing day. And yet the President and the Republican majority have no plan to end it. From the President we get the usual platitudes and this week a photo-op in Iraq. And in this body, what is supposed to be the people's House, we are embarking on a pointless debate on a nonbinding Iraq resolution that is long on rhetoric and short on constructive solutions.

It is time we listened to the American people. It is time that the Commander in Chief stepped up by offering a solution instead of dismissing Americans' anxieties as "just politics."

I have outlined a plan that will end the occupation in Iraq while helping Iraq build a free and democratic society. We must engage the international

community, including the U.N. and NATO, to establish a multinational interim security force for Iraq. The U.N.'s Department of Peacekeeping Operations is particularly well suited for this task.

We must shift the U.S. role from that of Iraq's military occupier to its reconstruction partner by working with the Iraqi people to rebuild their economic and physical infrastructure, and we must work with the U.N. to establish an International Peace Commission comprised of members of the global community who have experience in international conflict resolution to oversee Iraq's postwar reconciliation process.

□ 1815

They, our troops, have served admirably. They have sacrificed more than enough. We can return them to their families and we can do it without abandoning Iraq. This is what the American people want, Mr. Speaker. They want an end to this war. They are not certain exactly how or when, but it is our job to execute those details. They are looking to us for leadership and it is time the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief, provided it.

ACTIONS OF MARK MALLOCH BROWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations has had a myriad of problems over the last 4, 5, 6 years. There has been tremendous scandals, there has been waste, fraud and abuse. There have been atrocities perpetrated by the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Africa where they raped women and maimed other people. We had the Oil-for-Food scandal. It just goes on and on and on. And as a result our new U.N. Ambassador has been over there trying to clean up that mess and make sure that they start straightening up and dealing with their fiscal problems as well as these other problems.

As a result, the second in command at the United Nations, a U.N. Deputy Secretary, General Mark Malloch Brown, last week made a very aggressive speech about the United States of America. He said that middle America, in effect, was too stupid to understand what the U.N. was all about. He indicated that news broadcasts from valued news resources such as Fox News and news commentators such as Rush Limbaugh were way out of line and didn't understand what was going on at the U.N. And he criticized roundly the entire United States approach to the U.N. and to world problems.

Now, there is an unwritten law at the United Nations and that is that the leadership over there and the people that are involved in leadership don't

criticize member states. They just don't do it. Malloch Brown did, and he is the Chief Deputy to Kofi Annan, the Secretary General of the United Nations.

And it is my opinion, because of this terrible misstatement that he made, that he should be replaced. He should either resign or be fired. If we are going to work with the U.N., and we pay 25 percent of the dues over there for the whole world, 25 percent, then we need to have a good working relationship, and this is not conducive to this relationship when the second in command over there is criticizing the United States for taking issue with what is going on.

THE IRAQ WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I come this evening to share information that I think the American public must know and understand about what is going on in the Congress of the United States of America and what is going on with this war in Iraq. It is important that I do that this evening because tomorrow there will be on the floor of Congress a so-called debate. But it is a sham debate. This is a debate formed around a resolution, H. Res. 861, that the Republicans have put together in an attempt, one more time, to fool the American people about what they are doing. This resolution was dreamed up after the Republicans determined that the polls were consistently against the way this war is being managed. This resolution was put together after they went home on break and they heard over and over again that the American public is getting fed up with this war, the amount of money that is being spent, the number of lives that are being lost, and so they come to the floor, after having done no oversight, never explaining to the American public how billions of dollars are being spent, never taking the time to find out about the corruption and the mismanagement in Iraq, never investigating the lies and the lack of intelligence and all that has been happening. They have the audacity to come before the public in a so-called debate with the resolution simply designed to trap the Democrats.

It is a resolution that says all kinds of things. Do you love the soldier or don't you? If you don't support our resolution, you are not for the soldiers in Iraq. And so many Democrats are going to get trapped because they claim that in their districts they have half of their constituents for it, this war, and half against it, and they don't know what to do. And so when they have to confront a phony debate and a phony resolution, they may just say yes because they don't want to be criticized for not being patriotic and loving the soldiers and supporting them.